The Bee

BY INDUSTRY WE THRIVE.

SEVENTH YEAR. EARLINGTON, HOPKINS COUNTY, KENTUCKY, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1896. NO. 36

EXTRA

BOURKE COCKRAN ANSWERS BRYAN.

Speech Delivered at Madison Square Garden, New York, Tuesday Evening, Aug. 18.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Fellow Democrats, All:

With the inspiring strains of the national song still ringing in our ears who can doubt the issue of this campaign? That issue has been well stated by your presiding officer. Stripped, as he says, of all verbal disguise, it is an issue of common honesty, an issue between the honest discharge and the dishonest repudiation of public and private obligations. It is a question as to whether the powers of this government shall be used to protect honest industry or to tempt the citizen to dishonesty.

On this question honest men cannot differ. It is one of morals and of justice. It involves the existence of social order. It is the contest for civilization itself. If it be disheartening to Democrats and to lovers of free institutions to find an issue of this character projecting into a presidential campaign, this meeting furnishes us with an inspiring truth of how that issue will be met by the people. A Democratic convention may renounce the Democratic faith, but the Democracy remains faithful to Democratic principles. Democratic leaders may betray a convention to the Populists, but they cannot seduce the footsteps of Democratic voters from the pathway of honor and of justice. A candidate bearing the mandate of a Democratic convention may in this hall open a canvass leveled against the foundations of social order, but he beholds the Democratic masses confronting him organized for the defense.

Fellow Democrats, let us not disguise from ourselves the fact that we bear in this contest a serious and grave and solemn burden of duty. We must raise our hands against the nominee of our party, and we must do it to preserve the future of that party itself. We must oppose the nominee of the Chicago convention, and we know full well that the success of our opposition will mean our own exclusion from public life, but we will be consoled and gratified by the reflection that it will prove that the American people cannot be divided into parties on a question of simple morals or of common honesty. We would look in vain through the speech delivered here one week ago to find a true statement of the issue involved in this canvass. Indeed, I believe it is doubtful if the candidate himself quite understands the nature of the faith which he professes. I say this not in criticism of his ability, but in justice to his morality. I believe that if he himself understood the inevitable consequences of the doctrines which he preaches, his own hands would be the very first to tear down the platform on which he stands.

A Soil Not Propitious to Revolution.

But there was one statement in that speech which was very free from ambiguity, pregnant with hope and confidence to the lovers of order. He professes his unquestioned belief in the honesty of the American masses, and he quoted Abraham Lincoln in support of the faith that was in him. Well, I do not believe that the faith of Abraham Lincoln was ever more significantly justified than in the appearance which Mr. Bryan presented upon this platform in the change that has come over the spirit and the tone of Populistic eloquence since the Chicago convention.

We all must remember that lurid rhetoric which glowed as fiercely in the western skies as that sunlight which through the past week foretold the torrid heat of the ensuing day, and here upon this platform we find that same rhetoric as mild, as insipid as the waters of a stagnant pool. He is a candidate who was swept into the nomination by a wave of popular enthusiasm, awakened by appeals to prejudice and greed. He is a candidate who on his trip home and in the initial steps of his trip eastward declared that this was a revolutionary movement; who no sooner found himself face to face with the American feeling than he realized that this soil is not propitious to revolution.

The people of this country will not change the institutions which have stood the tests and experiences of a century for institutions based upon the fantastic dreams of Populist agitators. The American nation will never consent to substitute for the republic of Washington, of Jefferson and of Jackson the republic of an Altgeld, a Tillman or a Bryan. The power of public opinion which caused the vivid oratory of the Chicago platform to burn low and soft as the moonlight outside of this platform, which has already shown its power to control Populistic eloquence, will show the full extent of its wisdom, will give Abraham Lincoln's prophecy its triumphant vindication when it crushes the seed of Populistic socialism next November.

Proposed Violation of the Constitution.

Now, my friends, I have said there was one statement of great significance in Mr. Bryan's speech. There is another portion of it which is singularly free from any obscurity, and that may be comprised within the two initial paragraphs where he talks logically, consistently, plainly, the language of revolution. Whatever change may have come over his manner as a candidate, however much the vehemence of his eloquence may have been reduced, two things for which he stands remain unaltered.

On this platform he defended the most revolutionary plank of the Chicago convention in speech less vehement, but not less earnest, than that in which he supported its adoption. On this platform he defended the Populistic programme of overthrowing the integrity of the supreme court. If there be any fruit which has grown for the benefit of all mankind out of the establishment of our republic, it has been the demonstration that it is possible by the organization of an independent tribunal to safeguard the rights of every citizen and protect those natural privileges against any invasion from whatever source or however powerful might be the antagonizing elements.

The very existence of that power presupposes the existence of an independent tribunal. Yet we have this Populist convention, because a Populist measure was condemned as unconstitutional, proposing, not to amend the constitution in the ordinary way prescribed by that instrument itself, but proposing to pack the court, to reorganize it (he used the language of the platform itself) so that it will pronounce these laws to be constitutional which the constitution itself condemns—a proposal to make the courts of law instruments of lawlessness, to violate that sacred pact between the states on which the security of this nation rests, to profane the temple erected for its protection by the hands of false priests, who, though sworn to defend it, will be appointed to destroy it.

In the time to which I must confine myself tonight I can do nothing but examine that one question which Mr. Bryan himself declares to be the overshadowing issue of this campaign. I am a little puzzled when I read this speech to decide just what Mr. Bryan himself imagines will be the fruit of a change in the standard of value throughout this country. I do not believe that any man can follow wholly with the speech, because if he dissents from one set of conclusions he has got to read but a few paragraphs and he will find another of a different variety. But I assume that it is fair in a discussion of this character, independently of what Mr. Bryan may say or what Mr. Bryan may think himself he stands for, to examine the inevitable economic effects of a debasement of the coinage, of a change in the standard by which existing debts are to be measured in a baser measure of value.

A Test of Prosperity.

Now, I will imagine that Mr. Bryan himself may believe that in some way or other he is going to benefit the toilers of this country. He says he is, but he declines to show us how. For my part I am willing to state here that if Mr. Bryan could show me that by any means known to heaven or known on earth, any means revealed to the comprehension of man, wages could be increased, I will be ready to support him here and now. I do not make this statement through any pretense of special affection for the man who works with his hands. Such a pretense made in the heat of a presidential canvass would merely insult and discredit the intelligence to which it is addressed. I repeat that I would support any measure calculated to increase the rate of wages because I know of no test of prosperity absolutely infallible except the rate of wages paid to laborers. Where the rate of wages is high, there must be prosperity. Where the rate of wages is low, there must necessarily be distress.

If, then, Mr. Bryan can show me that by the enforcement of any portion of his programme wages will be increased in this country, I will not only support him, but I will recognize him as the wisest orator that ever opened his mouth on a platform since the beginning of the world. I will be ready to confess that the rhetoric which I do not now understand is really the language of inspiration. I would regard his administration of the presidency as the kindling of a great light before the footsteps of man, showing him a broad pathway to endless happiness and measureless prosperity. But in searching through his speech, in reading through the whole reams of Populistic literature with which this country has been flooded for four years, I have never yet found one syllable which showed me how a Populist expected to increase the rate of wages.

Now, in order to understand the significance of the remark that wages is the only test of prosperity, we have but to consider for a moment just what is meant by the term wages. Wages, as I suppose everybody here understands, is that part of the laborer's product which is given to himself in compensation for his toil. If, for instance, I be engaged in the manufacture of chairs, and if I can make five chairs every day worth $20, and the rate of my wages is $4 a day, what I actually get is one chair out of the five which I make. The other four chairs, the other four-fifths of my product, are devoted to the payment of all the other labor that has been expended in preparing the elements out of which the chair was made. To the man who felled the tree in the forest, the person who sawed it in the mill, the carrier who transported it, the workman who prepared its component parts, and the profit on the capital which set all this labor in motion.

It is plain, however, that I could not take one chair home with me at night and attempt to settle my bills with it, for the moment I undertook to divide the chair among my creditors, that moment it would lose its value. So, instead of taking the chair, which I cannot divide, I take its equivalent in money, which I can divide. But my wages all the time are fixed by the quantity of my own products.

If, instead of five chairs, I were able to make ten from it, and the rate of my compensation remained the same, I would obtain for my wages two chairs, or $8 a day. But, instead of there being four chairs, or $16, available for the payment of other labor, there would be eight chairs at $32, and thus the larger my wages the larger my product, the greater the prosperity in the chair making industry.

Now, applying that principle to every other department of trade we can see that the man who works on a tunnel cannot take a part of the tunnel home with him for his wages; the man who paves the street cannot take a part of the highway with him, but each one takes the money equivalent of that part of the product which is the result of his daily toil, and the laborer is the man who has the most vital interest in the character of the money which is paid to him.

Some of Mr. Bryan's Contradictions.

Now, when we come to find out just how Mr. Bryan expects to increase the wages of labor, we find ourselves lost in a maze of contradiction and in a haze of obscure expressions. No man can tell how or where or when the wages of the workingman are to be increased, but any one who examines the scheme can see that the inevitable tendency, the inevitable consequence of a debasement in the standard of value, must be a reduction in the rate of wages, and that is the conspiracy in which the Populist is engaged.

Now, Mr. Bryan tells us that he wants to cheapen the dollar; that he wants to increase the volume of money. I do not believe that any man who ever lived could quite understand a Populist's notion of what money is further than that he believes it is a desirable thing to get and that he is not very particular about the means by which he can get his hands on it. Nothing is more common in Populist oratory than the statement that the volume of money must be increased for the benefit of the people—which means that part of the people that runs and manages and addresses Populist meetings.

I remember that in one of the speeches which Mr. Bryan delivered on his way east he declared that any man who objected to too much money ought to vote the other ticket. Now, my friends, I will ask you to indulge me for a moment while I state to you here the only conception that an honest man can form of money, in order that in discussing this thing hereafter we will be able to understand the economic expressions which the Populist uses for the delusion of man and for the confusion of his judgment.

The basis of sound trade is sound money. Money which is intrinsically valuable—money which, like the gold coinage of this country, government cannot affect if it tried to. I can take a $10 goldpiece and I can defy all the power of all the governments of this earth to take 5 cents of value from it. Having earned it by the sweat of my brow, having earned it by the exercise of my brain, having earned it by the exchange of my commodities, I can go to the uttermost ends of the earth and wherever I present it its value will be unquestioned and unchallenged. That gold dollar, this meeting, the Democratic party, the honest masses of this country, without distinction of party divisions, demand shall be paid to the laborer when he earns it and that no power on earth shall cheat him of the sweat of his brow.

Man's Labor Creates Wealth.

Now let us see how Mr. Bryan proposes to deal with this question. I have looked through his speech to find out just what he thinks he is going to do for the laboring man and I find that he dismisses him with a very few and some very unsatisfactory phrases. But it is perfectly clear that the purpose of the Populist is to put up the prices of certain commodities. Mr. Bryan's language is that he is going to improve the condition of the people of this country; not of all of them, but of the greatest number. Well, now, I don't suppose Mr. Bryan pretends to any miraculous power. I don't suppose he claims he can multiply the number of chairs upon this platform or upon this floor, although he has shown his capacity to empty them.

If he is going to work any change in the conditions of men, he must increase the material possessions of some part of the community. Now, if he got possession of the government tomorrow, he could not create one single thing of value by any exercise of governmental power in the world.

Money and Property Not Identical.

Nothing is more common than the mistake that money and property are identical. They are not. A redundancy of money does not prove any prosperity. There may be a very large volume of circulating medium and very great poverty. The issue of paper money simply is no more an increase of wealth than the issue by an individual of his promissory note would show an increase of his property. As matter of fact an increase in the coinage is no proof of an increase in property, but may be a strong proof of a decrease in wealth.

The volume of money plays but a small part even in the ordinary transactions of life. It is not the volume of money, but the activity of money that counts. If a person wants to see just how a dollar works in the ordinary exchanges, in what might be called a retail business, he has but to take a dollar out of his pocket and go out into the street and buy some fruit. Now, the fruit dealer would take that dollar and buy some vegetables. The greengrocer with the same dollar could buy neckties. The dealer in neckties with the same dollar could buy meat, and so on. That one coin passing from hand to hand might circulate $20 worth of commodities in the course of a single day. That one dollar circulating $20 worth of commodities makes more business and more trade than two dollars could make if they circulated between them only $10 worth of commodities.

Money never can circulate freely and actively unless there be absolute confidence in its value. If a man doubts whether the money in his pocket will be as valuable tomorrow as it is today, he will decline to exchange his commodity against it, and this Populist agitation threatening the integrity of money has been the cause of the hard times through which this country is passing and from which it will not escape until the heel of popular condemnation is placed upon the Populist agitation which undermines the foundation of credit.

Basis of Trade Is Sound Money.

If, then, Mr. Bryan is going to enrich somebody, the thing which he means to bestow on him he must take from somebody else. Who is to be despoiled and who is to be enriched by the exercise of this new scheme of government?

My friends, the silver mine owner will get cheated with the rest. If ever the Populist has his way, nobody will be benefited, not even Mr. Bryan. I will venture to say here now that if the face of Providence should be averted from this land and such a calamity as Mr. Bryan's election were permitted by it, the man who would suffer most by that event would be the false prophet, who, having torn down the temple of credit and of industry, would be torn to pieces by an outraged public whose prosperity he had ruined. Let us follow this argument a little. Let us see what he means to do, according to his own lights.

We see that he can't enrich one man without impoverishing another. Government never can be generous, because if it be generous to one it must be oppressive to another. Mr. Bryan does not pretend that by any power given him from heaven he can find anything on the surface of this earth that has not got an owner, and, therefore, he can't honestly bestow it upon a favorite.

But his financial scheme contemplates an increase in the price of certain commodities. I do not think that anything Mr. Bryan can do with reference to gold will ever affect it.

A Cutting Down of Wages.

But, my friends, we are coming now pretty close to the wood pile behind which the African is concealed. Mr. Bryan proposes to increase the price of commodities. If he means anything, he means that, and I am not quite sure that he means anything.

Now, if everything in this world or in this country, including labor, be increased in value tomorrow, in like proportion, not one of us would be affected at all. If that was Mr. Bryan's scheme, he would never have a Populist nomination to give him importance in the eyes of this community. If that were all that he meant, he would not be supporting it, and I would not be taking the trouble to oppose it.

If everything in the world be increased 10 per cent in value, why, we would pay 10 per cent in addition for what we would buy and get 10 per cent more for what we would sell, and we would be exactly in the same place we occupied before. Therefore it is fair to assume that is not the lame and impotent conclusion which this Populist revolution contemplates. What, then, is it?

It is an increase in the price of commodities and allowing of labor to shift for itself. If the price of commodities be increased and the price of labor be left stationary, why, that means a cutting down of the rate of wages. If, instead of a dollar which consists of a given quantity of gold equal to 100 cents anywhere in the world, with the purchasing power of 100 cents, the laborer is to be paid in dollars worth 50 cents each, why, he can only buy half as much with a day's wages as he buys now.

A Test Question for Mr. Bryan.

If the value of this Populist scheme then is to be tested, let the laboring men of this country ask Mr. Bryan and his Populist friends a simple, common, everyday question, "Where do I come in?"

Mr. Bryan himself has a glimmering idea of where the laborer will come in, or rather of where he will go out. There is one paragraph in his speech which, whether it was the result of an unconscious stumbling into candor or whether it was a contribution made in the stress of logical discussion I am utterly unable to say. But it shakes a flood of light upon the whole purpose underlying this Populist agitation. Wage earners, Mr. Bryan says, know that while a gold standard raises the purchasing power of the dollar, it also make it more difficult to obtain possession of the dollar. They know that employment is less permanent, loss of work more probable and re-employment less certain. If that means anything, it means that a cheap dollar would give him more employment, more frequent employment, more work and a chance to get re-employment after he was discharged. Well, now, if that means anything in the world to a sane man, it means that if the laborer is willing to have his wages cut down he will get more work.

High Wages and Prosperity Go Together.

There never was the boss of an establishment yet that meant to make a cut in wages that did not say that. I have never yet heard of anybody who attempted to cut down the rate of wages telling his men that he did it because he liked to do it. They would tell their men, "If you do not stand such a cut in wages, I cannot employ you more than half the time."

And that is what Mr. Bryan proposes for the laboring masses of this community—that they take a dollar of less purchasing power so that employment will become more certain and the chance of re-employment more frequent. If it were true that a reduction in the rate of wages would increase the chance of employment, I would not blame Mr. Bryan for telling the truth, because, however unpalatable the truth may be, I conceive it the duty of any man who attempts to address his fellow citizens never to shrink from a statement of the whole truth whatever may be the consequences to himself.

But, as a matter of fact, a diminution in the rate of wages does not increase the scope of employment. If this audience has done me the honor to follow me while I explained the principle on which wages were fixed, it must be clear that the more abundant the product the higher the wages. There cannot be an abundant product unless labor is extensively employed.

You cannot have high wages unless there is an extensive production in every department of industry, and that is why I claim that the wages are the one sole test of a country's condition; that high wages mean abundant protection and abundance necessarily means prosperity.

Farmer Tempted to War on Labor.

Mr. Bryan, on the other hand, would have you believe that prosperity is advanced by cheapening the rate of wages, but the fall in the rate of wages always comes from a narrow production and narrow production means there is little demand for labor in the market. When, after the panic of 1873, the price of labor fell to 90 cents a day, it was harder to obtain labor than when the rate of labor was $2, and the difference between the Populist who seeks to cut down the rate of wages and the Democrat who seeks to protect it is that the Democrat believes that high wages and prosperity are synonymous, and the Populist wants to cut the rate of wages in order that he may tempt the farmer to make war upon his own workingmen.

Well, but the Populist tells us—and Mr. Bryan leads the van—that it is the creditor that he is after; that the creditor is the person whose debt he wants to cut down. And Mr. Bryan makes an elaborate argument to show that when his system of coinage shall have been completed, his standard of value shall have been changed, then the debtor will have an option as to which metal he will pay his debt in—that is to say, he shall be permitted by the law to commit an act of dishonesty.

Part of Money in Measuring Debts.

In order that you should understand just how a change in the standard of value enables men to cheat their creditors you have to consider the function which money plays in measuring debts. If I had paid $10 for ten yards of cloth to be delivered to me next week, and in the interim the government should pass a law declaring that hereafter the yard measure should consist of 18 inches and that all existing contracts should be settled in that system of measure, I would be cheated out of half of the cloth for which I had paid. If, on the other hand, I owed a cloth merchant for ten yards of cloth which he had delivered to me, and which was payable next week, and in the meantime the government would change the standard of value and cut down the unit of coinage one-half, then I would settle that debt for $5, and the cloth merchant would have been cheated.

That is just what this measure proposes to do, and the important question that arises to the workman of this country is just who are the creditors and who are the debtors in this land. Now, the Populist loves to say that the creditor is a person who oppresses the western farmer. He loves to paint him as loud of dress, coarse of feature, gaudy of ornament and with a cruel expression on his face. He loves to declare that the money lender and the creditor are always synonymous expressions, but, as a matter of fact the creditors of this country are not the bankers; they are not the so-called capitalists. They are the laborers, and it is at the expense of labor that this change is made.

The Banker a Debtor, the Laborer a Creditor.

I remember in a discussion in the house of representatives I was advancing the proposition that a banker, in the nature of things, was a debtor, and I was interrupted by Mr. Bryan, who put to me a question which contains exactly the same statement as that which he made here in his speech a week ago. He asked me, "I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is not true that every solvent bank has for every dollar that it owes either somebody's note or the money in the vault and its own capital besides?"

Now, my answer to that I can give here. The loans and resources of a solvent bank taken together must exceed its liabilities. The excess represents the capital and profit. But as between their debts and their credits all banks are debtors, which, my friends, will be apparent to you in a moment if you consider that a bank must keep 25 per cent of its deposits in reserve; that the very business of banking is the business of being in debt. It is the business of dealing with other people's money, and of course the money that it deals with is the money that it owes to its depositors.

But the laborer is always a creditor for at least one day's work. When any man can show me a laborer who has been paid in advance for a day's work, I will show him a laborer who is a debtor. But every laborer that I have ever known in my experience, every laborer of whom I have ever heard in my examination of the conditions of men, must by the very law of his being be a creditor for at least one day's work and is generally a creditor for a week's work or two weeks' work.

Every great industrial enterprise has for its chief creditors its own laborers. The heaviest account in every department of industry, whatever it may be, is always the wages account.

Wages a First Lien.

Here is an abstract which will show you just how the earnings of a great corporation are distributed.

The New York Central railroad handles ever year about $45,000,000. Of that sum $10,000,000 is paid for interest on bonds and for rental of leased railroads, $4,000,000 is paid for dividends, $13,000,000 is paid for equipment and repairs, and $15,500,000 is paid for wages.

The railway employees of the United States alone draw $400,000,000 a year in wages. If the New York Central railroad went into the hands of a receiver tomorrow, if it became totally and hopelessly bankrupt, its dividends could be passed and its shareholders could not complain. The interest on its bonds might be in default and the bondholders would be without redress, but the wages of the laborer would always be paid, for they are a first lien upon every industrial enterprise. Not, my friends, because they love the labor of man, but because he is absolutely necessary to the existence of the enterprise.

Here we have the figures from the United States bureau of statistics showing the amount of wages paid every year in the United States, and we find that it was over $9,283,250,000. Talk of the interest on the national debt, talk of the principal of the national debt, talk of any other debt that exists throughout the civilized world, and it forms but a small percentage of this debt which is due to labor, wherever man works and toils, wherever things of value are being created, wherever means of transportation are in activity, wherever the forces of civilization are at work.

A farm is an industrial enterprise. The pretense that the farmer of Nebraska is suffering under the weight of a mortgage contracted under a metal which has steadily increased in value is but a Populistic metaphor. Two-thirds of the farmers have no mortgage debt whatever. I do not believe there is 5 per cent of them that owe a mortgage over three years old, during which time there has been no change in the value of the metal, but every single farmer is a creditor in the shape of his own labors.

The Farmer a Mainstay of Order.

This proposal of the Populists is an attempt to enlist the farmer in a conspiracy to reduce the wages paid this labor that he may have a larger proportion of his own products, and they are willing to cut down the wage of every man who works in cities, who toils at the bench, who digs in the mines, who manages the train, in the hope that they can ride into power on a wave of cupidity and greed awakened in the breast of the voter.

But, my friends, it is a triumphant vindication of American citizenship that this attempt to enlist the farming and agricultural members of this community into this conspiracy has failed miserably, utterly, absolutely. Every western state which in 1890 and 1892 fell into the hands of the Populists or went into the Farmers' Alliance, before their real purposes were executed, was purified and the Populistic forces were scattered out of existence when the farmers of this country understood precisely what the Populists meant for his welfare was really for his ruin.

The farmer who when this country was in danger shouldered his musket, to set it aside when the last shot had been fired on the southern battlefield, whose moderation prevented the political warriors at Washington from pursuing a policy of discrimination and punishment in the southern states—that farmer, who made the policy of the north a policy of conciliation, of forgiveness, of reunion, whose hand it was that made ruins of her cities and ashes of her homes, received her once more and said, "Live in peace and sin no more."

That farmer today is the mainstay of order and of property, as he was the mainstay of the Union.

There was a Populistic delegation from states that were Democratic, but it is a significant fact that every northern state in which there was a chance of electing a Democratic governor or of choosing Democratic electors, with the exception of Missouri and Indiana, stood boldly and firmly for the gold standard at Chicago, and they were submerged by a wave of Populism from the south.

My friends, there has been a great change in the Democratic organization of the southern states. The men who, from a mistaken sense of loyalty, followed their states out of the Union, whose gallantry in war, whose fortitude in defeat won the admiration of the civilized world, the men whose virtues commanded the support of northern public opinion in the attempt to overturn carpetbag governments in the southern states, the men who led their people through all the troubled period of reconstruction back into a full union with the sister states—these men, like Hampton in South Carolina and Caffery in Louisiana, have been swept from power, a new set has got into the saddle, a set of leaders of which Tillman is the exponent, who boldly unfurled the sectional flag at Chicago and declares that this Populist movement is a direct movement against the prosperity of the east.

Conspiracy Against the Industrial Masses.

Men of New York, toilers of America, guardians of your own homes, will you allow your rate of wages to be affected by any men who never has paid wages at all if he could get out of it? Will you submit to this conspiracy between the professional farmers, the farmers who cultivate the quarrels of their neighbors, farmers who labor with their jaws, Populist agitators of the west, and the unreconciled slaveholders of the south? This is a conspiracy between professional farmers who want to pay low wages and the unreconciled slaveholder who would like to pay no wages. Here is the real root of this conspiracy. Here is the explanation of this Populist movement.

Mr. Bryan did not create it. No men can create a movement like this. The forces that created it are active and have been working in a thousand different directions. Mr. Bryan, representing this theory, is but like a drop of water on the crest of the wave, more conspicuous but no more important than the millions of drops that form its base. The Populistic movement is the attempt of these professional farmers, of these men who are unwilling to share with the laborer, to appeal to their greed in support of theirs. He is an enemy of public order. He is an obstacle to progress. He is a conspirator against the peace and prosperity of the industrial masses of the country.

Civilization Threatened.

I have said that the laborer is the object of this conspiracy, and he is. But let no man imagine that if they were successful the injury would all be borne by the man who works with his hands. He would be the first to suffer and the last to recover from its effects. But the shock to civilization which would ensue from such a breach of public and private faith would be irreparable. Its effect no man could measure from any experience of the human race. We cannot tell to what degree it would paralyze industry.

If I were asked to define civilization, I should say it was industrial co-operation. Everything that a man does for his own benefit acts directly upon the interests of his neighbors. No man can stand alone in a civilized community. His interests, his prospects, his misfortunes, are to some extent shared by all his fellows. There is not an ear of corn ripening in a western field that does not affect the price of bread to you and me. The farmer who scatters seed upon the ground by that act starts in motion the wheels of the factory, he sharpens the tools of the carpenter, he stimulates the construction of railroads, he causes the engineers to plan new bridges crossing currents, new tunnels under rivers, new canals joining oceans and separating continents.

If the farmer did not work, if the miner did not dig in the subterranean gallery, every other department of industry would languish, for men would not produce and create if they did not see in the industry and activity of others a prospect of a demand for the commodity which they produce, and so every man in the world is bound closely to the destiny and interests of his fellow man.

Underlying Trouble With Populists.

Underlying the whole scheme of civilization is the confidence men have in each other—confidence in their honesty, confidence in their integrity, confidence in their industry, confidence in their future. If we went to a silver coinage tomorrow, if we even debased our standard of value, men say that still you would have the same property you have today, you would still have the same soil, you would still have the same continent. And it is true.

Now the underlying trouble with all Populists is that they have a fundamental misconception of the principles on which civilized society is constructed. All through Mr. Bryan's speech, all through Mr. Tillman's utterances in the convention, wherever you find Populists assembled, you will find discussions proceeding upon the theory that men are hostile to each other in their interests; that the condition of life is one of contest.

I merely desire to call the attention of this gathering to the character of that speech, to the underlying spirit that pervades it, and then to ask the workingman of this country to ask the citizens of this nation if the government should be trusted to the hands of men whose conception of civilized society is one of warfare and of strife.

The Whole Nation Will Resist.

We believe that the very essence of civilization is mutual interest, mutual forbearance, mutual co-operation. We believe the world has got past the time when men's hands are at each other's throats. We believe today that men stand shoulder to shoulder, working together for a common purpose beneficial to all, and we believe that this attempt to assail wages, which means an attempt to attack the prosperity of all, will be resisted, not by a class, but by the whole nation.

What labor has gained, that it shall keep. The rate of wages that is paid to it today is the lowest rate we will ever willingly accept. We look forward to a further and a further increase in the prosperity of workingmen, not merely by an increase in the daily wage, but by further increase in the purchasing power of wages. Men who tell me that the prices of farm products have fallen and that the farmer for that reason is a sufferer forget that while the price of wages has risen on the farm the efficiency of labor has increased; that the cost of production has been reduced through the aid of machinery, while the wages of the individual laborer may have risen.

While wages remain at their present rate I hope there will be a further and further decrease in the cost of living. There is no way in which I can be admitted to a share of God's bounty except through a fall in the prices of the necessaries of life. While we have in existence a society of mutual co-operation which is but another name for civilized society, all men are admitted to a share in every bounty which Providence showers upon the earth.

The dweller in the tenement house, stooping over his bench, who never sees a field of waving corn, who has never inhaled the perfume of grasses and of flowers, is yet made the participator in all the bounties of Providence in the fructifying influence of the atmosphere, in the ripening rays of the sun, when the product of the soil is made cheaper to him every day by the abundance of the harvest. It is from his share in this bounty that the Populists wants to exclude the American workingman.

Labor Must Not Be Scourged.

To him we say, in the name of humanity, in the name of progress: "You shall neither press a crown of thorns upon the brow of labor nor place a scourge upon his back. You shall not rob him of any one advantage which he has gained by long years of study, of progress in the skill of his craft, and by the careful organization of the members who work with him at the same bench. You shall not obscure the golden prospect of a further improvement in his condition by a further cheapening of the cost of living as well as by a further appreciation of the dollar which is paid to him."

There can be no distress, there can be no hard times while labor is well paid. The man who raises his hand against the progress of the workingman raises his hand against prosperity. He seeks to restrict the volume of production. He seeks to degrade the condition of the men who is steadily improving himself and in his own improvement is accomplishing the improvement of all mankind. But this attempt will fail.

I do not regret this campaign. I am glad this issue has arisen. The time has come when the people of this country will show their capacity for self government. They will prove that the men who have led the world in the pathway of progress will be the jealous guardians of liberty and of order. They are not to be seduced by appeals to their cupidity or moved by threats of injury. They will forever jealously guard and trim the lamp of enlightenment, of progress. They will ever relentlessly press and crush under their heels the flaming torch of Populist discontent, Populist agitation and Populist destruction.

When this tide of anarchy shall have receded, this tide of Populist agitation, this assault upon common honesty and upon industry shall have abated forever, the foundations of this republic will remain undisturbed. This government will still shelter a people indissolubly wedded to liberty and order, jealously forbidding any distinction of burden or of privilege, conserving property, maintaining morality, resting forever upon the broad basis of American patriotism and American intelligence.

The Bee

BY INDUSTRY WE THRIVE.

SEVENTH YEAR. EARLINGTON, HOPKINS COUNTY, KENTUCKY, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1896. NO. 36

EXTRA.

SHERMAN ON SOUND MONEY

The Ohio Senator's Great Speech at Columbus.

SILVER FALLACIES EXPOSED

Brief Review of Coinage Legislation In the United States.

THE RESULTS OF FREE SILVER.

The Foremost Financial Authority of the Nation Tells How Free Coinage Would Unsettle the Business World—Workingmen Would Suffer—Silver Monometallism Threatened—Inconsistencies of the Silver Senators—An Able and Interesting Argument.

The Republican campaign in Ohio was opened at Columbus Aug. 15 with a meeting attended by 10,000 persons. Governor Asa Bushnell presided, and speeches were made by Senator Sherman, Senator Elect Foraker and General Stewart L. Woodford of New York. Following is the full text of Senator Sherman's address:

MR. CHAIRMAN AND FELLOW CITIZENS—A citizen of Ohio has been selected by the Republican national convention as its candidate for president of the United States, and we are here to ratify and support his nomination. We take pride in William McKinley not only for the honor conferred upon Ohio by the convention, but because we know him to be fitted for that great office. We know that since his boyhood his life has been pure and stainless; that as a soldier in the Union army he was brave and loyal; that as a member of congress for many years he exhibited the highest mental traits and rendered great services to his country, and that as governor of Ohio he proved his capacity to perform difficult executive duties. And he has the higher claim upon us that during all his active life he has been a faithful and able Republican, thoroughly in sympathy with the principles of the Republican party. That party does not rest its claims to your confidence merely upon the merits of its candidates, but upon the soundness of its public policy, its measures and its aims.

It is the distinguishing feature of our Republican government that every question affecting the people of the United States must ultimately be determined by them at the ballot box. Every legal voter has an equal voice in deciding it, however difficult the problem may be. It so happens that at the coming presidential election there will be submitted to your judgment two such questions, one of which is whether any holder of silver bullion may deposit it at the mints of the United States and have it coined for his benefit and without cost to him into silver dollars, each of the weight of 412½ grains of standard silver nine-tenths fine, and may tender them for any debt, public or private. The other question is, whether in levying duties or taxes on imported goods we should only consider the revenue required, or whether, while raising the needed revenue, we should seek also to protect and encourage domestic industries. The one is called revenue tariff and the other a protective tariff. Both the silver and tariff are vital questions of domestic policy of equal importance, but I propose on this occasion to confine my remarks mainly to what is known as the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 parts of silver to 1 of gold.

This issue is thrust upon us by the Democratic party, or rather by the Populistic branch of the Democratic party. Gold and silver coins are recognized by all commercial nations of the world as the best standards of value, as the measure of every article of desire, of everything that is bought or sold. These two metals not only measure all other things, but they measure each other. Their relative value constantly changes. Twenty-three years ago 16 ounces of silver were worth more than 1 ounce of gold. Now 31 ounces of silver can be bought by 1 ounce of gold. This fluctuation of value cannot be prevented by law. It is beyond the reach of legislation. It is caused by the changing demands for and the increasing supply of these metals from the mines. Both are necessary as money, silver to supply the daily wants of life and gold to measure the larger transactions of business, especially in exchanges with foreign nations. How to maintain the parity of the two metals at a fixed ratio has been, is and always will be a difficult problem, not only in the United States, but in the civilized world.

Early Coinage History.

It was one of the first questions to occupy the attention of American statesmen after the adoption of the constitution and is now one of the most pressing, after more than 100 years of national growth. In 1792 silver and gold were made the common standards of value in the United States at the ratio of 15 to 1, but this was because that then the actual market value of 15 ounces of silver was equal to the actual market value of 1 ounce of gold. The greatest care was taken to ascertain this ratio by Thomas Jefferson, then secretary of state, and Alexander Hamilton, then secretary of the treasury. These two distinguished statesmen, who disagreed upon nearly all other questions, did agree upon the then relative value of the two metals and that both should be coined into money at that ratio.

At that time neither gold nor silver was found in any considerable quantity in the 13 states then forming the Union. The Revolutionary war had been conducted with paper money, which became worthless, and the coins of Spain, England and other countries had been made a legal tender and continued so for many years after the adoption of the constitution.

When the new American coins were issued, it was found that the abraded and worn coins of other countries filled the channels of circulation, and the new and bright dollars of the United States were exported. This led to the discontinuance, in 1806, by President Jefferson of the coinage of the silver dollar, and after that date none was coined for more than 30 years. This order of Jefferson, I suppose, would be called by our Populistic friends "the crime of 1806." In the meantime France and other countries adopted the ratio of 15½ ounces of silver as the equivalent of 1 ounce of gold. To avoid these embarrassing changes England in 1816 adopted gold as the single standard in that country and silver as subsidiary coin.

In 1834, during the administration of President Jackson and under the leadership of Daniel Webster and Thomas H. Benton, congress adopted the ratio of 16 of silver to 1 of gold by reducing the number of grains in the gold coin. As silver was thus slightly undervalued it was not largely coined.

Gold Basis Established.

Silver could be coined in France at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and the owner of silver bullion could send it to France and have it converted into coin at that ratio, thus receiving about 3 per cent more for his bullion than if coined at the American ratio of 16 to 1. Gold became the only American coin in circulation, and the avowed purpose of the passage of the law of 1834 was to make gold the standard. This was declared by the committee of the house of representatives who had charge of the bill, who said in their report:

"The committee think that the desideratum in the monetary system is a standard of uniform value. They cannot ascertain that both metals have ever circulated simultaneously, concurrently and indiscriminately in any country where there are banks or money dealers, and they entertain the conviction that the nearest approach to an invariable standard is its establishment in one metal, which metal shall compose exclusively the currency for large payments."

This law, heartily approved by Andrew Jackson, would now be called "the crime of 1834." In 1853, upon the report of Senator Hunter, when Pierce was president, and when all branches of the government were under Democratic control, congress reduced the quantity of silver in the fractional coins (half dimes, dimes, quarters and half dollars) more than 6 per cent, directed the purchase of the silver for their coinage on government account, abolished the law for their free coinage and made them a legal tender for $5 only, leaving gold still practically the only full legal tender United States coin. At this time the silver dollar had disappeared from the current coins of the United States and was practically and purposely demonetized.

The purpose of this act is thus stated by the chairman of the committee having the bill in charge in the house of representatives:

"We propose, so far as those coins are concerned, to make silver subservient to the gold coin of the country. We intend to do what the best writers on political economy have approved; what experience, where the experiment has been tried, has demonstrated to be the best and what the committee believes to be necessary and proper—to make but one standard of currency and to make all others subservient to it. We mean to make gold the standard coin."

Democratic Party Once a Gold Party.

This, I suppose, would now be called "the crime of 1853." Silver was practically demonetized by this act and the act of 1834.

It is certain that from 1801, when Mr. Jefferson became president, to the close of Buchanan's administration in 1861, the Democratic party was a gold party, opposed to silver and all forms of paper money. As I have already stated, Mr. Jefferson, in 1806, suspended the coinage of silver dollars, and it remained suspended for more than 30 years. The act of congress of 1834 established gold as practically the only coin in circulation. Gold coins were Benton's "mint drops." All Democrats were then "goldbugs." Senator Hunter, in 1853, during Pierce's administration, secured the passage of a law which reduced the silver in the half dimes, dimes, quarters and half dollars, making them subsidiary coins, abolished their free coinage and limited their legal tender to $5. The silver dollar was not mentioned and practically was excluded from coinage or circulation—yet now the Democratic party, upon the demand of the Populist party, and when silver has fallen in market value to nearly one-half its former value, seeks to demonetize gold and to establish silver as the sole standard of value.

When the Republican party came into power in 1861 by the election of Mr. Lincoln, it had to face a formidable rebellion. Gold and silver were alike banished from circulation, and irredeemable paper money of all denominations, from 10 cents to $1,000, was substituted in place of coin. When the war was over, the Republican party sought to restore specie payment as soon as practicable. In March, 1869, it pledged the faith of the nation to payment in coin or its equivalent of all bonds of the United States and to redeem the United States notes at the earliest practicable moment in coin.

The Law of 1873.

In order to carry out this pledge it became necessary to revise the various coinage laws of the United States. This was promptly and very carefully done by a bill framed in the treasury department while Mr. Boutwell was secretary. It was thoroughly considered by the experts of that department and was printed and submitted to all persons in the United States who were supposed to be familiar with the coinage laws. The bill, containing 67 sections, accompanied by a mass of information that fills a volume, was sent to congress April 25, 1870, by Secretary Boutwell, and its passage was strongly recommended by him. This bill omitted from the coins of the United States the silver dollar, precisely as was done in 1853, but provided for the coinage of the fractional parts of the dollar in accordance with the act of that year. This bill was pending in congress for three years—was carefully considered in both houses and special attention was called to the omission of the 412½ grain silver dollar, which was never in the bill at any stage, and the reasons for this omission given. It was finally determined, at the urgent request of members from the Pacific coast, to insert among the silver coins a trade dollar containing 420 grains of standard silver, but this dollar was made, like the minor coins, a legal tender for $5 only. There was no yea and nay vote on the bill, except that was on the proposition to repeal the charge made by the mint for the coinage of gold. I voted against its repeal. The bill passed both houses and became a law Feb. 12, 1873, by practically a unanimous vote of both parties, and was specially supported and voted for by the senators and members from the silver states.

This has been called the "crime of 1873," and as the bill was under my charge in the senate I was held to be the chief criminal. It was, in fact, a wise measure of public policy, carefully discussed and considered during three years.

When we test the outcry against this act with the sober facts shown by official records, it appears simply ludicrous. The total number of silver dollars coined from 1792 to 1873 was 8,031,238, while the number of trade dollars issued under the coinage act of 1873, containing 7½ grains more silver than the old dollar, was 35,965,924, and the number of standard silver dollars coined under the Bland-Allison act of 1878 was 430,790,041, or 54 times the number issued before 1873.

Some Personal Inconsistencies.

It is strange that the very men who supported and urged this coinage law of 1873 and demanded the exclusive coinage of gold are the very men who now demand the free coinage of silver and denounce as "goldites" and "robbers" all those who believe in the coinage of both gold and silver. It has been said that the dropping of the silver dollar in the coinage act of 1873 was surreptitiously done. This charge is shown to be false by the debates in congress, and especially by the declarations of the men who now make the charge. Sixteen months after the passage of that act Senator Jones of Nevada in a debate in the senate June 11, 1874, said:

"I am opposed to any proposition, come in whatever form it may, that attempts to override what God himself has made for money. I believe the sooner we come down to a purely gold standard the better it will be for the country."

On April 1, 1874, he said: "Does this congress mean now to leave entirely out of view and discard forever a standard of value? And what but gold can be that standard? What other thing on earth possesses the requisite qualities? * * * Gold is the articulation of commerce. It is the most potent agent of civilization. It is gold that has lifted the nations from barbarism. It is the common denominator of values. It makes possible the classification of labor and the interchange of commodities. Gold has intervened in bargains made between men since the dawn of civilization, and it has never failed to faithfully fulfill its part as the universal agent and servant of mankind. * * * The value of gold is not affected by the stamp of the government."

Senator Stewart of Nevada in the same debate on June 12, 1874, said: "The laboring man and the producer are entitled to have their product and their labor measured by the same standard of the world that measures your national debt. * * * Give them such a standard, give them money as you require from them. You require it from the producer. You require from the laboring man gold to pay the interest on your national debt, which is right, which cannot be avoided if you mean to save national honor; but then give him the same money with which to pay that debt. The question will never be settled until you determine the simple question whether the laboring man is entitled to have a gold dollar if he earns it or whether you are going to cheat him with something else. That is the upshot of the whole thing. Everybody has to say that the laboring man was entitled to a good dollar. That was fought over. They will fight it over again, and the same party will win. There have been a great many battles fought against gold, but gold has won every time. Gold never has compromised. * * * Gold has made the world respect it all the time. The English people once thought they could get along without gold for awhile, but they had to come back to it."

Selfishness Steps In.

On June 1, 1874, Senators Jones and Stewart and all the representatives and senators of the silver states were urgent and honest in saying that gold was the best and only standard of value, but they changed their minds when the largely increased and increasing production of silver in Nevada and other states reduced the market value of silver below that of gold at the established ratio of 15 to 1. Then they wanted a market for their silver. They wanted to pay existing debts and obligations contracted upon a gold basis in silver, but took care in their contracts to stipulate for the payment of gold to them, and this has been and is now the general practice in the silver states. When the coinage law of 1873 was enacted, all of the states except those on the Pacific coast conducted their business upon the basis of greenbacks or United States notes, then at a discount of about 13 per cent. Neither silver nor gold was used in domestic transactions, but we collected our customs duties in gold coin and conducted our foreign commerce in gold, the money of the world. It was not until January, 1878, that the first step was taken to resume specie payments, nor did we resume until January, 1879.

During this period silver rapidly fell in market value below gold at the ratio of 16 to 1. Prior and subsequent to 1873 many changes were made in coinage by the leading countries of the world. Germany in 1871 changed its standard from silver to gold. France, Italy, Switzerland and Belgium had in 1865 entered into a treaty called the Latin union, to which other nations became parties, and by which the coins of each of these countries were received and paid out by all of them. This important arrangement was first modified and finally abandoned, and gold became the standard of value in those countries, but in all silver was coined and largely used as a subsidiary coin precisely as in the United States.

The Bland-Allison Act.

In anticipation of the resumption of specie payments, the resumption act of 1875 provided silver coins, of dimes, quarters and half dollars, for the redemption of the fractional currency then in general use in our country. These new silver coins gave great satisfaction. They were limited in legal tender qualities to $10. At this time Mr. Bland of Missouri introduced his bill for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 on the demand of the holders of silver bullion. Silver had then declined below that ratio. One ounce of gold was worth more than 16 ounces of silver. The Bland bill, if it had become a law as it passed the house, would have demonetized gold. Such was not the purpose of congress.

When the bill came to the senate, an amendment was made, on the motion of Senator Allison, which changed the scope of the bill and authorized and directed the secretary of the treasury to purchase from time to time silver bullion at the market price, not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth per month, and cause it to be coined into silver dollars as fast as purchased. It also provided that any holder of the coin authorized by that act might deposit the same with the treasurer of the United States in sums not less than $10 and receive certificates therefor of not less than $10 each, and that the coin deposited should be retained in the treasury for the payment of the certificates on demand. This bill so amended passed both houses. It was known as the Bland-Allison act. It greatly added to the difficulties of resumption, and for that reason was vetoed by President Hayes, but became a law over his veto. Under its provisions the United States purchased over 291,000,000 ounces of silver at the cost of $308,279,260. It was hoped that this enormous purchase would arrest the decline of silver, but in spite of it silver steadily declined in market value, and at the present price the loss to the government on the purchase of silver under this act amounts to over $100,000,000.

The Silver Purchase Law.

When congress met in December, 1889, there was a strong desire in both houses to utilize silver as legal tender money under conditions that would not demonetize gold. As the result of long discussions in both houses and after a conference between them a bill was passed July 14, 1890, by which the secretary of the treasury was directed to purchase from time to time silver bullion to the aggregate of 4,500,000 ounces a month at the market price, and to issue in payment of such purchases treasury notes of the United States, which were made a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, and were redeemable by the secretary of the treasury in gold or silver coin at his discretion. This measure, it was thought, would arrest the decline in the market value of silver and enable the secretary to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other at the ratio of 16 to 1. But the market value of silver continued to decline. The government purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, 168,000,000 ounces at a cost of $156,000,000. This proved to be an expensive experiment, and the act was repealed Nov. 1, 1893. This repeal was accompanied by the following declaration, made a part of the repealing act:

"And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is further declared that the efforts of the government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts."

This declaration, made by congress and approved by the president, at a time when the public mind was centered upon the silver question, is a wise statement of public policy that ought to be acted upon without regard to party divisions. This bill passed a house of representatives fresh from the people by the vote of 239 yeas to 118 nays and the senate by the vote of 48 yeas against 32 nays. This act was not a party vote, but it is, I believe, the expression of opinion of a majority of the two great parties of the country.

And here, fellow citizens, we ought to stand. I appeal to Democrats and Republicans alike. We are all interested in having a sound and stable currency founded upon gold and silver. We cannot by law fix the value of either metal or coin or of any of the articles that enter into the wants of life.

Loss In Buying Silver.

The great law of demand and supply affects the value as it does iron, copper or zinc. All have fallen in market value by means of new discoveries and improved methods of production. I have here a statement of the director of the mint, dated July 31, 1896, showing the amount and cost of silver bullion purchased under the acts of 1878 and 1890 and its value at the present market price, showing a shrinkage of over $145,000,000.

Hon. John Sherman, Mansfield, O.:

SIR—I have the honor to state in reply to your letter of the 15th inst. that the aggregate amount and cost of silver bullion purchased under the acts of Feb. 28, 1878, and July 14, 1890, was as follows:

	Fine ounces.	Cost.
Act of Feb. 28, 1878	291,272,018 56	$308,279,260 71
Act of July 14, 1890	168,674,682 53	155,931,002 25
Totals	459,946,701 09	$464,210,262 96
Worth at today's market price for silver — namely, $0.69212 per fine ounce		$18,338,310 75
Loss in purchase		$145,871,952 21

Respectfully yours, R. E. PRESTON, Director of the Mint.

We had July 1 last in actual circulation among the people of the United States $1,509,725,200, as stated by the report of the treasury department, which I will read:

	Amount in circulation July 1, 1896.
Gold coin	$456,128,483
Standard silver dollars	52,175,998
Subsidiary silver	59,999,905
Gold certificates	42,320,759
Silver certificates	331,259,509
Treasury notes, act July 14, 1890	95,217,361
United States notes	225,451,288
Currency certificates, act June 8, 1872	31,840,000
National bank notes	215,331,927
Total	$1,509,725,200

We had also at that date $684,519,981 in the treasury, mostly gold and silver, held for the redemption of United States notes and silver certificates as follows:

Gold coin	$111,303,340
Standard silver dollars	378,614,043
Subsidiary silver	15,780,976
Gold certificates	497,430
Silver certificates	11,389,985
Treasury notes, act July 14, 1890	34,465,919
United States notes	121,299,639
Currency certificates, act June 8, 1872	150,000
National bank notes	10,608,620
Total	$684,519,981

All these forms of money have been maintained by the government at par with gold, and they travel the circle of the world without diminution of their purchasing power. Though silver bullion has fallen to nearly one-half its former value yet we have used it and maintained silver coin made from it at parity with gold at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Silver Monometallism Threatened.

But now we are brought face to face with a proposition which if agreed to will make silver the sole standard of value for all debts and credits, for the wages of labor and the purchase and sale of property. The Democratic party at its recent convention at Chicago adopted a resolution in favor of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 parts of silver to 1 of gold. We know that in the United States and in all countries in the world 30 ounces or more of silver can be purchased by 1 ounce of gold. With the free coinage of silver gold will be demonetized. Nothing can be more certain than that the cheaper money only will circulate. The United States has thus far maintained its silver coins at parity with gold coins only by its exclusive monopoly of coinage, and by limiting the amount, but with free coinage of silver there could be no limitation. Silver bullion in every form will be pressed upon the mints and with the mandatory duty of free coinage silver dollars will soon fill the channels of circulation and the gold dollar will be hoarded or will be quoted and sold as a commodity at about 194 cents of the silver coin. Silver will stand as the par value and gold will be quoted at its commercial value.

Let us contemplate for awhile the inevitable result of the free coinage of silver even if I repeat what I say. It would violate every contract for the payment of money made since Jan. 1, 1879. The resumption act, which went into operation on that day, provided for the payment in coin on demand of all United States notes presented for redemption. All forms of money, whether of silver or gold or paper, were then maintained at par with each other and have been so maintained ever since. During all this period gold and silver coins at par with each other have been the standards of value of all loans, contracts or purchases, and the faith of the United States was pledged for their maintenance at parity with each other. Although silver bullion declined in market value, the coins made from it have been kept at par with gold coins at the legal ratio of 16 to 1.

But if the free coinage of silver is authorized then the market value of silver bullion becomes the standard for payments on all contracts made in the past, present or the future; 412½ grains of standard silver bullion, worth now 53 cents, can with free coinage be coined into a dollar upon the demand of any holder of such bullion. This dollar is delivered to the owner of the bullion and is not supported by the fiat of the government. The government does not undertake to maintain its relative value with gold. The government stamps it, "This is a dollar." Its purchasing power is 53 cents, but its debt paying power is $1. It is to be a legal tender for $1 of debt, but in the purchase of any article it is only worth 53 cents, for the seller of the article can fix his price according to the kind of money offered. It is the doctrine of the Populist and anarchist, but is in direct opposition to the traditional policy of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson and the Democratic party.

What Creditors Would Do.

When we contemplate the great amount of debt and credit that is unavoidable in a vast but new country like ours, we naturally shrink from any measure that will either rob the lender or do injustice to the borrower. It is impossible to estimate the wrong and injustice that will be done to creditors by the scaling of nearly one-half of debts due them. The very threat to do it will lead to the prompt and harsh collection of debts before free coinage can become a law. I am advised that already debts that would have remained uncalled for have, in fear of such a law, been enforced. It is certain that before a free coinage bill can become a law the wide distrust caused by the pending of such a measure will lead to the rapid collection of debts, the sacrifice of property, and deepen existing financial difficulties growing out of insufficient revenues for the national as well as for many state governments.

It is sometimes said of creditors that they are bloodthirsty Shylocks, aristocrats, bloodsuckers, extortioners. It may be that there are among money lenders some men who merit these epithets, but the great body of the creditors of our country are among the thrifty, industrious and intelligent men and women of every community. One great body of creditors here is the 970,000 Union soldiers, their widows and orphans, who are creditors of the United States to the amount of over $140,000,000 a year for services and sacrifices in the Union army. It would be an act of perfidy and meanness beyond expression for this great country to pay them with money of less purchasing power than gold coin merely because the overproduction of silver in the United States has reduced the market value of silver bullion contained in a silver dollar. To take advantage of this decline in order to reduce the value of the pittance to these pensioners is worse than to rob the graves of the dead.

There is another class of creditors that the free coinage of silver will greatly injure. It is the depositors in savings institutions and kindred organizations, who, according to official statistics, number nearly 5,000,000 people, and whose deposits amount to more than $1,800,000,000. Will you cheat them by reducing the value and purchasing power of the dollars they have deposited?

Free coinage will also wipe out nearly one-half the value of life insurance which provident people of the United States have paid to secure, in case of their death, some support and protection to wife and children. It will affect injuriously the multitude of clerks and employees who depend upon monthly pay and will reduce the purchasing power of all salaries of officers and employees in the public service of the United States and of every state, county, city or township in this broad land.

Workingmen In Greatest Danger.

But by far the greatest injury resulting from the free coinage of silver will fall upon the workingmen. Their wages are now based upon money of the highest value, upon gold coin of standard value. Under free coinage of silver the value of the silver dollar will fall to 53 cents in gold, or, as I have already said, the 100 cents of the gold dollar will be worth 194 cents of the silver dollar. With free coinage of silver every workingman can and ought to demand enough silver for his daily wages to be equal to the purchasing power of his present wages in gold. The struggle between the workingman and the employer will then commence, and no one knows better than the workingman how difficult it is to get an advance of pay. We have strikes and strife enough now, when the workingman gets his pay in gold coin or its equivalent, but what will be the condition if he is paid in cheaper money of the same nominal amount, but of less purchasing power? Every sentiment of justice will be on the side of the workingman in his struggle for good money or increased wages in cheap money. Of all the evils which a government can inflict none can be greater than cheap money, whether of coin or paper. That dollar is the best dollar that buys the largest quantity of food and clothing. That dollar is the gold dollar, for it buys more food and clothing than any other dollar and will also buy a silver dollar for 53 cents, if the coinage of silver is made free at the ratio of 16 to 1 of gold.

Experience has shown that the United States can make the silver dollar buy as much as the gold dollar, but it can only be done by the government buying silver bullion as needed and coining it into dollars on government account. This has been tried. Every country of Europe, except possibly Russia, republics and monarchies alike, maintain the gold standard and silver coins at parity with gold at even a less ratio than the United States, and now Russia has hoarded over $400,000,000 of gold in preparation for the gold standard which she will adopt.

We have now in the treasury belonging to the government over 379,000,000 silver dollars represented by certificates and also silver bullion costing over $118,000,000 in treasury notes in active circulation and maintained at par with gold at the ratio of 16 to 1. The free coinage of silver is an invitation not only to American miners, but to all miners or holders of silver in the world, to deposit their silver in the mints of the United States and receive in exchange therefor a silver dollar for every 412½ grains of standard silver deposited. But that silver is worth in the market only 53 cents. Why should we receive this bullion from the owners of silver mines at nearly double its market value when we have such a vast hoard in the treasury, which we hold with difficulty at par with gold? The only object and effect of this measure will be to degrade the dollar, to lessen its purchasing power nearly one-half, to enable debtors to pay their debts at 53 cents for a dollar and to cheat the public creditors who hold our bonds. If this policy should be adopted, the United States will take its place among the nations of the earth as a bankrupt, closing its business at 53 cents on the dollar.

Repudiation Considered.

There is another element of meanness in this free coinage of silver. The United States has always paid its bonds in gold coin or its equivalent. In the darkest hours of the civil war we stipulated to pay our bonds, principal and interest, in gold or its equivalent. All of the war debt has been paid in this way. A portion of it was paid by the sale of bonds bearing a lower rate of interest, but we exacted from the purchasers of these bonds gold coin or its equivalent even while our notes were below par in coin. About $847,000,000 of these securities are now outstanding, of which $262,000,000 was sold by this administration and paid for in gold coin. It is one of the objects of those who advocate the free coinage of silver to force the government to pay these bonds in silver coin reduced in value. It is harsh to express this opinion of a measure favored by many good people, but I cannot regard it in any other light than as both a fraud and a robbery and all the worse if committed by a great, rich and free people. A citizen who should commit such an offense would be punished by the courts or denounced as dishonest, but a nation like ours is beyond the power of any tribunal but conscience and God.

Now, fellow citizens, I have said all I desire to say at present on the free coinage of silver. I have the confident hope that the great body of the Republican and Democratic parties, representing the conservative elements of our people, will stamp their rebuke upon this measure of infamy and thus preserve intact the honor, the credit and glory of our great country. This matter of the free coinage of silver and the degradation of the standards of value involves not only questions of money, but of honor and good faith. When their honor is involved, the people never fail to respond. They have complied with every promise and paid every debt contracted since the organization of the national government as it became due. They have paid four-fifths of the debts contracted during the civil war, and the prospect was hopeful that all of it would be paid before the close of this century, but this reversing our standards of value has, like the fire bell at night, startled and alarmed our people. Let us settle it by following the action of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Benton, Hunter, Lincoln and Grant; let us maintain silver and gold at par with each other at the legal ratio of 16 to 1 until a conference among nations can prescribe common standards of value. In the meantime let no act be done, no policy be adopted, no experiment resorted to, that will tarnish the honor of this great republic.

THE CANDIDATES CONTRASTED.

Theatrical Display of the Boy Orator. McKinley's Quiet Dignity.

Recent political events have brought out in such a clear light the characteristics of the two leading candidates for the presidency that they cannot fail to impress the country. One of the candidates left his home and traveled half across the continent in order to receive a theatrical notification of his nomination. His coming had been heralded for weeks, and the most elaborate preparations had been made to receive him and make the event historical and decisive in a campaign sense.

Mr. Bryan came, was seen, talked and has retired for a time from the public gaze. Not even his most enthusiastic follower can claim that his journey has added one atom of strength to his candidacy, while any unprejudiced observer can see that it has dissipated that glamour that surrounded him while he was still an unknown quantity. His learned speeches have dropped flat. They were reported in full by the newspapers of both parties, but the public has not been able to find in any one of them a new thought or a phrasing of the issues of the campaign which will clear up any man's doubts. But the greatest failure of all was the speech in Madison Square Garden when with all the tinsel and trappings about him and with a human mine ready to be exploded by a train of burning eloquence he utterly failed to prove equal to the occasion.

While all this parade and ostentatious show has been going on the opposing candidate for the presidency has been quietly pursuing the even tenor of his way. Without any attempt at display or to dazzle the people, Mr. McKinley has extended a courteous welcome to all who have visited him and given a frank and appropriate reply to every greeting. The dignity and self poise of the man have impressed not only those who have seen and heard him, but also those who have been compelled to satisfy themselves with a telegraphic account of the event and the speech. His remarks have been so clear, concise and epigrammatic that they have impressed themselves upon the mind of those who have heard and read them, and they will furnish mottoes and catch phrases all through the campaign. Mr. McKinley has grown steadily in the estimation of the public as the canvass has proceeded and has not made a mistake for the enemy to gloat over.

It is easy to see that this dignified, self poised attitude of the Republican candidate is impressing the sober common sense of the country. The independent and Democratic newspapers that are supporting the cause of sound money have steadily grown warmer in their praise of Mr. McKinley as the number of his speeches has increased. No more enthusiastic commendation has been bestowed by his own party than has been given by Democratic newspapers to speeches made by the Republican candidate the past week. The Boston Herald says that "by all odds the most effective campaign work that is being done at present is to be credited to Major McKinley when he addresses his old army comrades. These occasions have been frequent of late, and Major McKinley's responses to the salutations of the veterans have been models of patriotic oratory."

When Major McKinley said, "I believe it is a good deal better to open up the mills of the United States to the labor of America than to open up the mints of the United States to the silver of the world," he gave his followers the issues of the campaign summed up in the tersest of language and in a shape that the busiest of voters can grasp. It is such things as these that are exhibiting to the country the real character of the Republican candidate for the presidency and impressing it with a sense of his fitness for that high office and leading the people to contrast him with the shallow pretense and evident attempt to deceive of his opponent.—Philadelphia Press.